

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-7003

JAMES C. MCNEILL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GEORGE E. CURRIE; MICHAEL MUNNS; RICHARD T.
JONES; TONIA RODGERS; TONY C. JONES; JAMES A.
REID; SHANTICIA HAWKINS; GEORGE TURNER; BETSY
BRANCH; MARVIN THOMAS; THEODIS BECK; BOYD
BENNETT; VIRGINIA LANCASTER; J. J. HAYNES;
LEIGH BRANCH; BULLOCK; HATTIE PIMPONG; EVELINE
FAULK; EARL V. ECHARD; JOSEPH LIGHTSEY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard,
District Judge. (CA-04-9-5-H)

Submitted: October 20, 2004

Decided: November 16, 2004

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James C. McNeill, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

James C. McNeill appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. The district court dismissed as frivolous McNeill's claims concerning the lack of due process in disciplinary hearings and dismissed without prejudice McNeill's claims concerning the denial of out-of-cell exercise time.* We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See McNeill v. Currie, No. CA-04-9-5-H (E.D.N.C. May 5, 2004). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

*Because McNeill challenges only the district court's decision concerning the denial of due process at the disciplinary hearings, our review is limited to that issue. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b).